arXiv:1610.01185v2 [cs.LO] 6 Oct 2016

Recursion-Theoretic Ranking and Compression

Lane A. Hemaspaandra and Daniel Rubery
Department of Computer Science
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627, USA

October 6, 2016

Abstract

For which sets A does there exist a mapping, computed by a total or partial recursive function, such that the mapping, when its domain is restricted to A, is a 1-to-1, onto mapping to Σ^*? And for which sets A does there exist such a mapping that respects the lexicographical ordering within A? Both cases are types of perfect, minimal hash functions. The complexity-theoretic versions of these notions are known as compression functions and ranking functions. The present paper defines and studies the recursion-theoretic versions of compression and ranking functions, and in particular studies the question of which sets have, or lack, such functions.

1 Introduction

This paper studies the recursion-theoretic case of how hard it is to squeeze the air (more concretely, the elements of its complement) out of a set A. That is, we want to, by a total recursive function or a partial recursive function, map in a 1-to-1, onto fashion from A to Σ^*. So our function, when viewed as being restricted to the domain A, is a bijection between A and Σ^*. In effect, each string in A is given a unique "name" (string) from Σ^*, and every "name" from Σ^* is used for some string in A. As has been pointed out for the complexity-theoretic analogue (where we are interested not in total and partial recursive functions, but in polynomial-time functions), such functions are the analogues for infinite sets of perfect (i.e., no collisions among elements in A), minimal (i.e., every element of Σ^* is hit by some element of A) hash functions, and are called *compression functions* [GHK92].

A particularly dramatic type of such function would be one that maps from the ith element of an infinite set A to the ith element of Σ^*. Such a function—a *ranking function*—has all the above properties and in addition respects the (lexicographical) ordering of the elements of A. This type of issue was first studied by Goldberg and Sipser [GS85, GS91] (see also the closely related, independent work of Allender [All85]), for the case of polynomial-time functions, a quarter of a century ago. That seminal work of Allender, Goldberg, and Sipser led other researchers to bring a closer lens to the issue of what behavior the ranking

function would be required to have on inputs that did not belong to A [HR90], to study more flexible notions such as the abovementioned compression functions [GHK92] and what are known as scalability [GH96] and semi-ranking [HOZZ06], and to study ranking of extremely simple sets ([Huy90, ÁJ93], see also [All85, GS91]). Even the original paper of Goldberg and Sipser already established that there are P sets whose ranking function is complete for the counting version of NP (namely #P), i.e., that quite simple sets can have quite complex ranking functions.

The present paper introduces and studies compression and ranking in their recursion-theoretic analogues. These basically are the same problems as in the complexity-theoretic case, except instead of studying what can (and cannot) be done by polynomial-time functions, we study what can (and cannot) be done by total recursive functions and partial recursive functions.

Why do we study this? After all, programmers are not clamoring to have recursion-theoretic perfect, minimal hash functions for infinite sets. But our motivation is not about satisfying a programming need. It is about learning more about the structure of sets, and the nature of—and in some cases the impossibility of—compression done by total and partial recursive functions. In particular, what classes of sets can we show to have, or not have, such compression and ranking functions?

Among our results are the following.

- Every 1-truth-table degree except the zero degree contains both sets that are recursively rankable and sets that are not recursively rankable (Theorems 5 and 7). (So some recursively rankable sets are undecidable, and some even fall outside of the arithmetical hierarchy.)

- Every 1-truth-table degree except the zero degree contains some set that is recursively compressible yet is not recursively rankable (Theorem 7).

- Every nonempty coRE cylinder is recursively compressible (Theorem 20), and it follows that all coRE-complete sets and all nonempty coRE index sets are recursively compressible (Theorem 21 and Corollary 22). However, no RE-complete set or coRE-complete set is recursively rankable or even partial-recursively rankable (Corollary 9 and Corollary 12).

- There are infinite Δ_2^0 sets that are not even partial-recursively compressible (Theorem 23).

- Every recursively compressible RE set is recursive (Theorem 17), but each infinite set in RE $-$ REC is an example of a partial-recursively compressible RE set that is not recursive or recursively compressible (Proposition 2 and Corollary 18). So although all coRE-complete sets are recursively compressible, no RE-complete set is recursively compressible.

2 Related Work

The most closely related papers are those mentioned in Section 1. Given the importance to this paper of mappings that are onto Σ^*, we mention also the line of work, dating back to Brassard, Fortune, and Hopcroft's early paper on one-way functions [BFH78], that looks at the complexity of inverting functions that map onto Σ^* [BFH78, FFNR03, HRW97, Rot99]. However, both that line and the papers mentioned in Section 1 are about complexity-theoretic functions, while in contrast the current paper is about recursion-theoretic functions.

In fact, this paper is quite the reverse of the typical direction of inspiration. A large number of the core concepts of complexity theory are defined by direct analogy with notions from recursive function theory. As just a few examples, NP, the polynomial hierarchy [MS72, Sto76], most of complexity theory's reduction notions [LLS75], (complexity-theoretic) creative/simple/immune/bimmune sets [Ber76, BS85, Hom86, Tor86, HM83], and the semi-feasible sets [Sel82] are lifted quite directly from recursive function theory, with, as needed, the appropriate, natural changes to focus on the deterministic and nondeterministic polynomial-time realms. The debt that complexity theory owes to recursive function theory is huge.

Far less common is for notions defined in complexity to then be studied recursion-theoretically. However, this paper is a small example of that, since it is taking the line of ranking/compression work started by Allender, Goldberg, and Sipser in the 1980s and asking the same type of questions in the setting of total and partial recursive functions.

3 Definitions

We have deferred all formal proofs (except the two-sentence proof of Proposition 2) from Sections 3, 4, and 5 to a separate section, Section 6, and have tried to write those three sections so that they convey the content of our results. For readers wishing to see to in addition see how our results are established, Section 6 provides proofs of all our results.

Throughout this paper, we fix the alphabet to be the binary alphabet $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$. So all our notions will involve (total or partial) functions whose input universe is Σ^* and whose codomain is Σ^*, and all classes (e.g., the recursive sets) are viewed as being over sets whose alphabet is Σ.

Why is it natural to focus just on $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$? For every two finite alphabets Σ' and Σ'', there is a recursive, order-respecting bijection between Σ'^* and Σ''^*. So for all natural purposes in the context of recursive function theory, any pair of finite alphabets are essentially computationally interchangeable.

$\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$ will denote the class of all total recursive functions from Σ^* to Σ^*. F_{PR} will denote the class of all partial recursive functions from Σ^* to Σ^*. $\mathrm{domain}(f)$ is the set of inputs on which a (potentially partial) function f is not undefined, e.g., if f is a total function, $\mathrm{domain}(f) = \Sigma^*$.

REC and RE will denote the recursive sets and the recursively enumerable sets. As usual,

coRE $= \{A \mid \overline{A} \in \text{RE}\}$ and Δ_2^0 the class of all sets A such that there exists a set $B \in \text{RE}$ such that A is recursive in B (i.e., A recursively Turing reduces to B). These are low levels of what is known as the *arithmetical (or Kleene–Mostowski) hierarchy* [Kle43, Mos47]. We will often use r.e. and co-r.e. as adjectival forms of RE and coRE, e.g., "each r.e. set belongs to the class RE," although at times we will also use the terms RE and coRE themselves as adjectives.

ϵ will denote the empty string, and we use "lexicographical" in its standard computer science sense, e.g., $\epsilon \leq_{\text{lex}} 0 \leq_{\text{lex}} 1 \leq_{\text{lex}} 00 \leq_{\text{lex}} \cdots$. successor$(x)$ will denote the lexicographical successor of x, e.g., successor$(11) = 000$. For any set $A \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and any string $x \in \Sigma^*$, $A^{\leq x}$ denotes all strings in A that are lexicographically less than or equal to x. $A^{<x}$ and $A^{\geq x}$ are defined analogously. We will use these notations even for Σ^* itself, e.g., if x is the string 10 then $(\Sigma^*)^{\leq x}$ is the set $\{\epsilon, 0, 1, 01, 10\}$. For each finite set A, $\|A\|$ will denote the cardinality of A. The function $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ will denote a fixed, standard, recursive pairing function, i.e., a recursive bijection between $\Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$ and Σ^*.

We say that A_1 and A_2 are *(recursively) isomorphic*, denoted $A_1 \equiv_{iso} A_2$, exactly if there is a 1-to-1, onto, total recursive function f from Σ^* to Σ^* such that $f(A_1) = A_2$. For any reducibility α, an α *degree* is an equivalence class with respect to the reducibility α. In this paper, the reducibilities whose degrees will at times be discussed are (recursive) many-one reductions ($\leq_m$) and (recursive) 1-truth-table reductions ($\leq_{1\text{-}tt}$). (Rather than define here the machinery of truth-table reductions just to define this very simple case, suffice it to say that A (recursively) 1-truth-table reduces to B exactly if A (recursively) Turing reduces to B via a transducer that on each input makes at most one query to B). All recursive sets belong to a single 1-truth-table degree, which in fact is exactly REC. All many-one degrees except the somewhat pathological many-one degree $\{\emptyset\}$ contain infinite sets.

The *Myhill Isomorphism Theorem* [Myh55] (or see [Soa87, pp. 24]) states that $A \equiv_{\text{iso}} B \iff A \equiv_1 B$, where $\leq_1$ denotes (recursive) 1-to-1 reductions. Though it is not a standard nickname, for convenience we will use the term *Myhill's Corollary* to refer to the result that all RE-complete (with respect to many-one recursive reductions) sets are recursively isomorphic; and we will also refer to as Myhill's Corollary the fact, semantically identical, that all coRE-complete (with respect to many-one recursive reductions) sets are recursively isomorphic. (Myhill's Corollary is well-known to with some argumentation follow from the Myhill Isomorphism Theorem, see, e.g., [Soa87, pp. 42–43] or [Odi89, Theorem III.6.6 + Corollary III.7.14].) K will denote the RE-complete set $\{x \mid x \in L(M_x)\}$, where $L(M_i)$ denotes the language accepted by M_i, and $M_1, M_2, M_3, \ldots$ (or the same using strings as the subscripts under the standard correspondence between positive natural numbers and strings) is a fixed, standard enumeration of (language-computing) Turing machines.

A set A is a *cylinder* exactly if for some B it holds that $A \equiv_{iso} B \times \Sigma^*$. We say that a set is coRE cylinder exactly if it is in coRE and is a cylinder.

We now define the class of compressible sets. Our definition is the precise analogue of the notion of P-compression of Goldsmith, Hemachandra, and Kunen [GHK92], except since we will be studying the recursion-theoretic case we have removed the requirement that the function be total and polynomial-time computable. Thus we are capturing the notion

of a function that when restricted to A creates a total (on A), 1-to-1, onto mapping to Σ^*.

Definition 1 (Compressible sets)**.**

1. *Given a set $A \subseteq \Sigma^*$, we say that a (possibly partial) function f is* a compression function for A *exactly if*
   (a) $\text{domain}(f) \supseteq A$,
   (b) $f(A) = \Sigma^*$, *and*
   (c) $(\forall a \in A)(\forall b \in A)[a \neq b \implies f(a) \neq f(b)]$.
2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be any class of (possibly partial) functions mapping from Σ^* to Σ^*. A set A is* $\mathcal{F}$-compressible *exactly if $(\exists f \in \mathcal{F})[f$ is a compression function for $A]$.*
3. *For each $\mathcal{F}$ as above, $\mathcal{F}$-compressible $= \{A \mid A$ is $\mathcal{F}$-compressible$\}$.*
4. *For each $\mathcal{F}$ as above and each $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{\Sigma^*}$, we say that $\mathcal{C}$ is* $\mathcal{F}$-compressible *exactly if $(\forall A \in \mathcal{C})[$If A is an infinite set, then A is $\mathcal{F}$-compressible$]$.*

In a slight notational overloading, the above definition uses $\mathcal{F}$-compressible both as an adjective and to represent the corresponding class of sets. Note that the above definition does not constrain what f does on elements of $\overline{A}$. f can be undefined on some or all of those, and if it is defined on some of those, note that that will make the overall map be non-1-to-1. Of course, f may otherwise be constrained to be total, e.g., when we speak of $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-compressible sets, the f involved must be total due to the definition of $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$.

No finite set has a compression function, since a finite set doesn't have enough strings in it to map *onto* Σ^*. This is why part 4 of the above definition defines a class of sets as being compressible under a certain type of function if all the class's infinite sets are thus compressible. Though we could rig even parts 2 and 3 of the definition of compression (rather than just part 4) to give finite sets a free pass, the given definition in each of these choices is exactly matching the long-standing, analogous complexity-theoretic definitions [GHK92]. When we do wish to speak of the compressible sets augmented by the finite sets, we will do so explicitly using the following:

$$\mathcal{F}\text{-compressible}' =_{\text{def}} \mathcal{F}\text{-compressible} \cup \{A \subseteq \Sigma^* \mid A \text{ is finite}\}.$$

To get a sense of how compression works in a simple case, let us note the following.

Proposition 2. RE *is* F_{PR}*-compressible.*

Proof. Let A be any r.e. set. Since A is r.e., there is an enumerating Turing machine that enumerates A without repetitions. Our F_{PR} compression function for A will map the ith enumerated string to the ith string in Σ^*, and will be undefined on all strings that are never enumerated (i.e., that belong to $\overline{A}$). □

Compression of A implies that in the image of the compression function on A we leave no holes: $f(A) = \Sigma^*$. That overall niceness however does not imply that f will never map any string in A to a lexicographically larger string. f certainly can, though the more often it does so, the more often other strings in A will need to map to lexicographically smaller strings, to prevent any "holes" in the image of A. The more demanding notion called ranking, however, *does* ensure that no string in A will map to a lexicographically larger string.

Ranking is a particularly nice type of compression—compression that simply maps the ith string in A to the ith string in Σ^*. There are three slightly differing versions of ranking, depending on what one requires regarding what happens on inputs that are not in A. The following definition follows the one of those that handles this analogously with the way it is handled in compression, e.g., on inputs that are not in A we allow the function to map to any strings it wants, or even to be undefined. (Informally put, the compression function can "lie" or can be undefined on inputs $x \notin A$.) Hemachandra and Rudich [HR90] (for the complexity-theoretic case) defined this notion and called it "weak ranking." However, to keep our notations for compression and ranking in harmony with each other, we will in this paper consistently refer to this simply as "ranking."[1]

Definition 3 (Rankable sets)**.**

1. *Given a set $A \subseteq \Sigma^*$, we say that a (possibly partial) function f is* a ranking function for A *exactly if*
   (a) $\text{domain}(f) \supseteq A$, *and*
   (b) *if $x \in A$, then $f(A) = \|A^{\leq x}\|$. (That is, if x is the ith string in A, then $f(x)$ is the ith string in Σ^*.)*
2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be any class of (possibly partial) functions mapping from Σ^* to Σ^*. A set A is* $\mathcal{F}$-rankable *exactly if $(\exists f \in \mathcal{F})[f$ is a ranking function for $A]$.*
3. *For each $\mathcal{F}$ as above, $\mathcal{F}$-rankable $= \{A \mid A$ is $\mathcal{F}$-rankable$\}$.*
4. *For each $\mathcal{F}$ as above and each $\mathcal{C} \subseteq 2^{\Sigma^*}$, we say that $\mathcal{C}$ is* $\mathcal{F}$-rankable *exactly if $(\forall A \in \mathcal{C})[A$ is $\mathcal{F}$-rankable$]$.*

[1] The other two approaches to handling $\overline{A}$ have a behavior is not too interesting in the recursion-theoretic world. (In the complexity-theory world, due to the work of Goldberg and Sipser [GS91] and Hemachandra and Rudich [HR90], it is known that for each of the three notions, one has that all P sets are polynomial-time rankable under that notion exactly if all $\#P$ functions—i.e., the counting version of NP—are polynomial-time computable.) The other two notions are (a) to additionally require that on members of $\overline{A}$ the function either is undefined or states that they are not members of A (this notion's analogue is called "ranking" in [HR90]), or (b) to additionally require that on members of $\overline{A}$ the function computes and outputs $\|A^{\leq x}\|$ (this notion's analogue is called "ranking" in [GS91] and is called "strong ranking" in [HR90]). However, under each of these notions, with respect to either of F_{REC} or F_{PR}, the class of sets thus rankable is exactly the recursive sets; we include a proof of this in Appendix 6. Thus these two notions, though interesting in the complexity-theoretic study of ranking, are not interesting in the recursion-theoretic study of ranking.

For example, clearly every recursive set is $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable by brute force. However, we will later see that, in contrast, some infinite r.e. sets are not even $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-compressible.

Aside from the quirk that finite sets cannot be compressible, rankability clearly implies compressibility. And of course, every total recursive function is a partial recursive function. So we have the following trivial containments.

Proposition 4. *1.* $(\forall \mathcal{F})[\mathcal{F}\text{-rankable} \subseteq \mathcal{F}\text{-compressible}']$.

2. $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-rankable* $\subseteq \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{PR}}$*-rankable.*

3. $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-compressible* $\subseteq \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{PR}}$*-compressible.*

4 Ranking

In Footnote 1 we noted that, for the ranking variants where the ranking function's behavior on the complement is constrained, the class of things that can be $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$ ranked, or even F_{PR} ranked, (in that variant) is precisely REC, the recursive sets.

In contrast with those variants, we now show that arbitrarily complex sets are $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable. So, certainly, some $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable sets are not recursive.

Theorem 5. *Every 1-truth-table degree contains an* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-rankable set.*

Corollary 6. *There exist sets A that are not in the arithmetical hierarchy yet are* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-rankable.*

However, it follows from Theorem 17 of the next section—which establishes that $\mathrm{REC} = \mathrm{RE} \cap \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}\text{-compressible}'$—that Theorem 5 cannot be improved from 1-truth-table degrees to many-one degrees.

Theorem 5 shows that $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable sets occur everywhere. Nonetheless, we show as Theorem 7 that the *non*-$\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable sets also occur everywhere. Theorem 8 notes that for the case of r.e. sets, F_{PR}-rankability even implies decidability, thus all sets in $\mathrm{RE} - \mathrm{REC}$ are non-$\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable.

Theorem 7. *Every 1-truth-table degree except that of the recursive sets contains a set that is* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-compressible but not* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-rankable.*

Theorem 8. *Every r.e.* F_{PR}*-rankable set is recursive. (Equivalently,* $\mathrm{REC} = \mathrm{RE} \cap \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{PR}}\text{-rankable} = \mathrm{RE} \cap \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}\text{-rankable.}$*)*

Corollary 9. *No* RE*-complete set is* F_{PR}*-rankable.*

Let us now turn to seeing how the co-r.e. sets—especially the coRE-complete sets—interact with $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankability and F_{PR}-rankability.

First, though, let us notice that for the co-r.e. sets, $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankability and F_{PR}-rankability precisely coincide (though unlike the case—see Theorem 8—of the RE sets, that as shown by Corollary 12 is not due to them both collapsing to the recursive sets).

Theorem 10. coRE $\cap$ $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-*rankable* = coRE $\cap$ F_{PR}-*rankable.*

Next we give the following theorem, which implies us our desired result about coRE-complete sets, and more.

Theorem 11. *If A is an* F_{PR}*-rankable co-r.e. set that has an infinite r.e. subset, then* $A \in \mathrm{REC}$*.*

Corollary 12. *No* coRE*-complete set is* F_{PR}*-rankable.*

Corollary 13. *Every* F_{PR}*-rankable co-r.e. cylinder is recursive.*

Though by Theorem 5 there are $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable sets in the 1-truth-table degree of K, we also know that none of those sets can be RE-complete or coRE-complete. The impossibility of them being coRE-complete follows from Corollary 12, which indeed precludes even F_{PR}-rankability. The impossibility of them being RE-complete will follow from the coming Corollary 18, which indeed precludes even $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-compressibility. We state this as the following corollary.

Corollary 14. *Although the 1-truth-table degree of the* RE*-complete sets contains* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-rankable sets, no* RE*-complete or* coRE*-complete sets are* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-rankable.*

5 Compression

Proposition 2 shows that every infinite r.e. set is F_{PR}-compressible. We note in passing that from that and Theorem 8 we immediately have the following.

Proposition 15. *There exist r.e. sets—in fact, all of* RE$-$REC*—that are* F_{PR}*-compressible yet are not* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-rankable or even* F_{PR}*-rankable.*

We will soon see that in that proposition F_{PR}-compressible cannot be improved to $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-compressible.

The following result shows that for $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$ compression (and even for Logspace compression, if one looks inside the proof of Theorem 5), compressible sets exist in every 1-truth-table degree. (This result is a corollary to the proof of Theorem 5—it follows, in light of Proposition 4's part 1, from the fact that the sets constructed in the proof of Theorem 5 are infinite.)

Corollary 16. *Every 1-truth-table degree contains an* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-compressible set.*

Can we improve Proposition 15's claim from F_{PR}-compressible to $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-compressible? Can we improve Corollary 16's claim from 1-truth-table degrees to many-one degrees (to avoid this being trivially impossible due to the pathological many-one degree that contains only the empty set, what we actually are asking is whether we can change Corollary 16 to "every many-one degree other than $\{\emptyset\}$ contains an $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-compressible set") or, and this would not be an improvement but rather would be an incomparable claim, can we

change the claim as just mentioned to all many-one degrees other than $\{\emptyset\}$ if we in addition restrict our attention just to the r.e. degrees? Or can we perhaps hope to show that RE $\subseteq$ $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible$'$? The following result establishes that the answer to each of these questions is "no"; $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$ compression is impossible for sets in RE $-$ REC.

Theorem 17. REC $=$ RE $\cap$ $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-*compressible*$'$.

Corollary 18. *No set in* RE $-$ REC *is* $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-*compressible. In particular, no* RE-*complete set is* $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-*compressible.*

Corollary 18 brings out a clear asymmetry, regarding compression, between RE and coRE: no RE-complete set is $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible, but as we will soon establish as Theorem 21, all coRE-complete sets are $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible.

Does Theorem 17 remain true if we change $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$ to $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$? We already know that answer is "no"; in fact, from Proposition 2 not only do we have that RE$\cap$$\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-compressible $\not\subseteq$ REC, we indeed have that RE $\cap$ $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-compressible$'$ $=$ RE.

As promised above, although the RE-complete sets—indeed, all sets in RE $-$ REC—are not $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible, we will now establish that all coRE-complete sets *are* $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible. Although we can prove that directly,[2] we will instead state a more general result (Theorem 20) of interest in its own right, and which yields the claim as a corollary.

Proposition 19. $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-*compressible and* $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-*compressible are each closed under recursive isomorphisms.*

Theorem 20. *Every* coRE *cylinder except* $\emptyset$ *is* $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-*compressible.*

Note that the set $\overline{\mathrm{K}}_{\mathrm{cyl}} =_{\mathrm{def}} \{\langle a, b\rangle \mid a \in \overline{\mathrm{K}} \wedge b \in \Sigma^*\}$ is clearly a coRE-complete cylinder (since it is trivially recursively isomorphic to the two-dimensional set $\overline{\mathrm{K}} \times \Sigma^*$ via $\langle a, b\rangle \mapsto (a, b)$). So by Theorem 20 we have that that coRE-complete set is $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible. But since $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible is, as Proposition 19 notes, clearly closed under recursive isomorphisms (as already has been analogously noted before for the case of polynomial-time compressibility and polynomial-time isomorphisms [GHK92]), and since by Myhill's Corollary all coRE-complete sets are recursively isomorphic to $\overline{\mathrm{K}}_{\mathrm{cyl}}$, we have that all coRE-complete sets are $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible. We summarize this as the following theorem.

Theorem 21. *All* coRE-*complete sets are* $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-*compressible.*

Fix a standard, nice indexing (naming scheme)—$\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \ldots$—for the partial recursive functions. A set A is an *index set* exactly if there exists a (possibly empty) collection $\mathcal{F}'$ of partial recursive functions such that $A = \{i \mid \phi_i \in \mathcal{F}'\}$. (Since all our sets are over Σ^*, we

[2] For the reader who might like a direct, simple proof of Theorem 21, we include here such a construction. Consider the set $A = \{\langle x, \epsilon\rangle \mid x \in \overline{\mathrm{K}}\} \cup \{\langle x, \mathrm{successor}(y)\rangle \mid M_x(x)$ accepts in exactly y steps$\}$, where successor(y) denotes the string immediately after y in lexicographical order. A clearly is coRE-complete and, since for each x there is exactly one y such that $\langle x, y\rangle \in A$, A is $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible via the function $f(\langle x, y\rangle) = x$. In fact, the proof of Theorem 20 is simply a more flexible version of this idea.

are implicitly associating the ith positive natural number with the ith string in Σ^*, so that our index sets are type-correct.)

Since all index sets are cylinders (see [Soa87, p. 23]; [Soa87]'s definition of cylinders is well-known—see [Rog67, Theorem VIII(c)]—to be equivalent to the definition given in our Section 3), and thus all co-r.e. index sets are co-r.e. cylinders, Theorem 20 implies that all co-r.e. index sets except (the finite, and thus not compressible index set) $\emptyset$ are $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-compressible.

Corollary 22. *All coRE index sets except* $\emptyset$ *are* $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$*-compressible.*

On the other hand, by diagonalization we can build a set, even one recursive in K, that is not compressible even by any F_{PR} function.

Theorem 23. $\Delta_2^0 \not\subseteq \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{PR}}$*-compressible*$'$*.*

6 Proofs

6.1 Proof for Section 3

In Footnote 1, we claimed that under both the "a" and "b" variants of ranking mentioned in that footnote, and for each of those under both $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$ and F_{PR} ranking functions, the class of sets thus ranked is exactly the recursive sets. We now prove that. It is immediately obvious that each recursive set is $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$ (the more restrictive of the two function classes) rankable even under the "b" variant, which is the more restrictive of the two variants. So all that remains is to show that each set that is F_{PR} rankable under the "a" variant is recursive. Let A be a set that is F_{PR} rankable under the "a" variant. If A is finite, then trivially $A \in \mathrm{REC}$. So let us consider the case where A is infinite. Let f be an F_{PR} ranking function for A of the variant "a" sort. Let us quickly make clear what variant "a" means, especially in the context of F_{PR} functions. If on an input f halts in an accepting state we view the string that is at that moment on its output tape (namely, from the left end of the output tape up to but not including the leftmost blank cell) as the output of f, and if f halts in a rejecting state we view it as stating that the input is not in the set. On inputs $x \in A$, f must output the string whose rank order within Σ^* is the same as the rank order of x within A. On inputs $x \notin A$, f can either halt in a rejecting state or run forever (but it cannot halt in an accepting state, i.e., it cannot output some string; this contrasts with Definition 3, which allows f to even "lie" on inputs $x \notin A$). Here is the description of a procedure, which halts on every input, for testing whether $x \in A$. In a standard dovetailing manner (i.e., interleaved, e.g., running on the first string in Σ^* for one step, then running on the first two strings in Σ^* for two steps each, then running on the first three strings in Σ^* for three steps each, and so on), run f on every string in Σ^*. If $f(x)$ is ever computed in that process, we reject x if $f(x)$ declares that x is not in A (recall that as noted above in variant "a" the ranker can declare the string to not be in A, in particular by halting in a rejecting state), and we accept x otherwise. Also, as the process goes on, if any string y such that $y >_{\mathrm{lex}} x$ evaluates to the lexicographically first string in Σ^*, namely ϵ, then we reject

x. Also, as the process goes on, if for some strings w and y with $w <_{\text{lex}} x <_{\text{lex}} y$ and such that $f(y)$ and $f(w)$ have both evaluated, it holds that $f(y)$ evaluates to the lexicographical successor of $f(w)$, then reject x.

At least one of these cases must eventually occur. Why? If $x \in A$, eventually, f will compute $f(x)$ and we will correctly accept. If $x \notin A$, then there are two cases. If x is lexicographically strictly less than the lexicographically first string z in A, then eventually we will evaluate $f(z)$ to be ϵ and will correctly reject x. Otherwise, eventually the strings in A that are most closely lexicographically greater than (recall that we are here handling the case that A is infinite, so such a string must exist) and less than x will evaluate under f, at which point we will correctly reject x.

6.2 Proofs for Section 4

Proof of Theorem 5. Let $\widehat{\oplus}$ be defined by $A \mathbin{\widehat{\oplus}} B = \{x0 \mid x \in A\} \cup \{x1 \mid x \in B\}$, i.e. this is the standard "join" (aka "disjoint union," aka "marked union"), except the marking bit is the low-order bit rather than as is standard the high-order bit. Note that for *any* set $A \subseteq \Sigma^*$, $A \mathbin{\widehat{\oplus}} \overline{A}$ is F_{REC}-rankable (indeed, it is even Logspace-rankable) by the function defined by

$$f(\epsilon) = \epsilon,\ f(z0) = z,\ \text{and}\ f(z1) = z,$$

since for each x exactly one of $x0$ and $x1$ is in $A \mathbin{\widehat{\oplus}} \overline{A}$, and $\epsilon \notin A \mathbin{\widehat{\oplus}} \overline{A}$. □

Proof of Theorem 7. Let A be an arbitrary nonrecursive set. Let $s_0, s_1, s_2, ...$ enumerate Σ^* in lexicographical order. Define

$$B = \{s_{4i} \mid i \geq 0\} \cup \{s_{4i+1} \mid s_i \in A\} \cup \{s_{4i+2} \mid i \geq 0\} \cup \{s_{4i+3} \mid s_i \in \overline{A}\}.$$

So B consists of a pattern that repeats every four strings. Namely, the first and third strings are always in, and exactly one of the second and fourth is in. Then $A \equiv_{1\text{-}tt} B$ and B is F_{REC}-compressible by the map f defined by

$$f(s_{4i}) = s_{3i},$$

$$f(s_{4i+1}) = s_{3i+1},$$

$$f(s_{4i+2}) = s_{3i+2},\ \text{and}$$

$$f(s_{4i+3}) = s_{3i+1}.$$

However, if B were F_{REC}-rankable, then A would be recursive. Why? If g is an F_{REC} ranking function for B, then it holds that

$$s_i \in A \iff g(s_{4i+2}) - g(s_{4i}) = 2.$$

Since A is not recursive, B cannot be F_{REC}-rankable. □

Proof of Theorem 8. This proof is similar in flavor to the proof that comprises the whole of Section 6.1, except in that proof but not here one has a model in which the ranker is not allowed to output "lies" as to the rank of nonmembers of the set, and here but not there we have the assumption that the set is r.e.

Let A be an r.e. $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-rankable set. Let f be an $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-ranking function for A. Since A is r.e., there exists an enumerating Turing machine, E, for A, and without loss of generality, we assume that E enumerates the elements of A without repetition. If A is finite, then A is recursive, so we in the following consider just the case that A is infinite. Here is our algorithm, which will always halt, to decide membership in A. On arbitrary input x, for which we wish to test whether $x \in A$, start running the enumerating machine E. Each time the machine outputs an element, run f on that element to determine the correct rank of that element (since the elements output by E all belong to A, f halts on each and outputs the correct rank value, e.g., if the string is the seventh string in A, the function f will output the lexicographically seventh string in Σ^*). Each time we thus obtain a rank, check to see if either: (a) the string just output by E is x, in which case accept as $x \in A$, (b) the ranker has mapped some string y output by E and satisfying $y >_{\mathrm{lex}} x$ to the string ϵ (i.e., has declared it to be the lexicographically least string in A), in which case reject as $x \notin A$, or (c) the ranker has mapped some two strings, y and y'—such that $y <_{\mathrm{lex}} x <_{\mathrm{lex}} y'$ and both y and y' have by now have been output by E—to outputs $f(y)$ and $f(y')$ such that $f(y')$ is the lexicographical successor in Σ^* of $f(y)$, in which case reject as $x \notin A$. □

Proof of Theorem 10. Let A be a set in $\mathrm{coRE} \cap \mathrm{F_{PR}}$-rankable. We give an $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-ranker for A. Namely, on input x, run both the $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-ranker f and an enumerator for $\overline{A}$, dovetailed, until we either get a value for $f(x)$ from the ranker or we see the enumerator state that $x \notin A$. If the former, output that value, and if the latter, output any fixed string, e.g., 101010. □

Proof of Theorem 11. Let A be as in the theorem's hypothesis. Let $s_0, s_1, s_2...$ enumerate Σ^* in lexicographical order. Let E be an enumerating Turing machine without repetitions for $\overline{A}$ and let F be an enumerating Turing machine for an infinite r.e. subset of A. Suppose g is a ranking function for A. In light of Theorem 10, A is $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-rankable $\iff$ A is $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-rankable, so w.l.o.g. we assume that $g \in \mathrm{F_{REC}}$.

Then the following procedure decides whether $x \in A$. Run F until it enumerates some string $s_n >_{\mathrm{lex}} x$. Compute $g(s_n)$. Since $s_n \in A$, $(\Sigma^*)^{\leq s_n}$ is composed of $g(s_n)$ members of A and $n - g(s_n)$ members of $\overline{A}$. Run E until it enumerates $n - g(s_n)$ strings in $(\Sigma^*)^{\leq s_n}$. If x is one of those $n - g(s_n)$ strings, then we know that $x \notin A$, and otherwise we know that $x \in A$. □

Proof of Corollary 12. This follows directly from Theorem 11, in light of Post's [Pos44] early result that every coRE-complete set has an infinite r.e. subset.[3] □

[3]Post's result is trivial to see these days, using the fact (what we are calling Myhill's Corollary) that all coRE-complete sets are isomorphic, but Post didn't have the benefit of Myhill's Corollary and thus proved his result directly. We note in passing the following slight extension of Post's result, since we could not find

Proof of Corollary 13. Each finite co-r.e. set is recursive. Each infinite co-r.e. cylinder has an infinite recursive subset (if the cylinder is recursively isomorphic to $B \times \Sigma^*$ via recursive isomorphism function h, then for any fixed $x \in B$, we have that the set $h^{-1}(\{(x, y) \mid y \in \Sigma^*\})$ is such an infinite recursive set), and so we are done by Theorem 11. □

6.3 Proofs for Section 5

Proof of Theorem 17. The $\subseteq$ direction is immediate. Let us show the $\supseteq$ direction. Let $A \in \mathrm{RE} \cap \mathrm{F_{REC}}\text{-compressible}'$. If A is finite then certainly $A \in \mathrm{REC}$, so only the case of infinite A remains. $A \in \mathrm{coRE}$, since, where f is the $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressor function for our infinite r.e. set A,

$$\overline{A} = \{x \mid (\exists y)[y \in A \wedge y \neq x \wedge f(y) = f(x)]\}.$$

So A is r.e. and co-r.e., and thus is recursive. □

Corollary 18 follows immediately from Theorem 17 and so needs no proof. Proposition 19 is immediate and needs no proof.

Proof of Theorem 20. Let A be co-r.e. and a cylinder. Let $s_0, s_1, s_2, ...$ enumerate Σ^* in lexicographical order. Let E be an enumerating Turing machine without repetitions for $\overline{A}$. Define $L_A = \{\langle x, \epsilon\rangle \mid x \in A\} \cup \{\langle x, s_i\rangle \mid x \text{ is the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ string enumerated by } E\}$. Then L_A is $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible by projection onto the first coordinate.

We claim that A is recursively isomorphic to L_A. Why?

Clearly $A \leq_1 L_A$ by mapping x to $\langle x, \epsilon\rangle$. Now let us show that $L_A \leq_1 A$. Fix strings $x_0 \in A$ and $x_1 \notin A$. Then the following gives a many-one reduction from L_A to A:

> On input $\langle x, s_i\rangle$, if $s_i = \epsilon$, output x. Otherwise, check if x is the i^{th} string enumerated by E. If so, output x_0. Otherwise, output x_1.

So $L_A \leq_m A$. Since A is a cylinder, it follows (by [Rog67, p. 89]) that $L_A \leq_1 A$. Since $A \leq_1 L_A$ and $L_A \leq_1 A$, by the Myhill Isomorphism Theorem L_A is recursively isomorphic to A, so by Proposition 19 A is $\mathrm{F_{REC}}$-compressible.

□

Theorem 21's proof is included in the text that comes immediately after Theorem 20. Why Corollary 22 follows is established in the text preceding it.

Proof of Theorem 23. Fix a standard enumeration of Turing machines, $M_1, M_2, M_3, ...$, with each machine viewed as computing a partial recursive function. ϕ_i will denote the partial recursive function computed by M_i. We will explicitly construct a set A that belongs to Δ_2^0 but that is not $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-compressible. This will be done by a stage construction. At stage i, we will define a set A_i and a string w_i. A will be defined as $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} A_i$. We will ensure

it in the existing literature: Every coRE-complete set has an infinite $\mathrm{RE} - \mathrm{REC}$ subset. To see this, just note that the coRE-complete set $\overline{\mathrm{K}} \oplus \Sigma^*$ has the infinite $\mathrm{RE} - \mathrm{REC}$ subset $\{1y \mid y \in \mathrm{K}\}$, and so by Myhill's Corollary the claim follows.

that $A_i \subseteq A_{i+1}$ and $A^{<w_i} = A_i^{<w_i}$. That is, after stage i, all strings lexicographically preceding w_i will be fixed—their membership/nonmembership in A will not be changed by later stages. At each stage i, $i \geq 1$, at least one string will be added to A, in order to ensure that A ultimately becomes infinite, and ϕ_i will be eliminated as a $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-compressor for A.

We start by setting A_0 to be $\emptyset$ and w_0 to be ϵ. We then do stage 1, then stage 2, etc.

At stage i, $i \geq 1$, first check whether ϕ_i is injective when restricted to $A_{i-1} \cup (\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}$. This is an r.e. condition, since we are looking for a pair (x, y) with $x, y \in \mathrm{domain}(\phi_i)$, $x \neq y$, $x, y \in A_{i-1} \cup (\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}$, and $\phi_i(x) = \phi_i(y)$. If such a pair exists (which our Δ_2^0 process can easily test), then we set A_i to be $A_{i-1} \cup \{x, y, w_{i-1}\}$, we set w_i to be $\mathrm{successor}(\max(x, y, w_{i-1}))$, and we go to stage $i + 1$. (We added w_{i-1} to ensure that we always add a string—even in the case that $x, y \in A_{i-1}$.) Since $x, y \in A_i$ (and thus $x, y \in A$) and $x \neq y$, we have ensured that for two strings in A, namely x and y, ϕ_i maps to the same output. So ϕ_i has been eliminated as a potential compressor for A.

However, if we cannot find such a pair (x, y), then we will freeze a string out of A in such a way as to permanently ensure that ϕ_i is not surjective. In particular, check whether $\phi_i((\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}) \neq \emptyset$. This is again an r.e. test. If the test determines that $\phi_i((\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}) \neq \emptyset$, then there is an $x \in (\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}$ such that $\phi_i(x)$ is defined. Let x be the lexicographically smallest string in $(\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}$ such that this holds. Such an x can be found by further r.e. queries (within our Δ_2^0 process). Then set A_i to be $A_{i-1} \cup \{\mathrm{successor}(x)\}$, set w_i to be $\mathrm{successor}(\mathrm{successor}(x))$, and go to stage $i+1$. Note that we have ensured that $\phi_i(x) \notin \phi(A)$ (the reason we know that no string in $A_{i-1} \cup (\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}$ can map to $\phi_i(x)$ is that if so we *would* have had a pair (x, y) of the sort sought above), and so $\phi_i(A) \neq \Sigma^*$, and so we have ensured that ϕ_i is not a compressor for A.

In the last remaining case, we must have $\phi_i((\Sigma^*)^{\geq w_{i-1}}) = \emptyset$. So ϕ_i is only defined for finitely many strings, and thus cannot be a compressor function for A. So set A_i to $A_{i-1} \cup \{w_{i-1}\}$, set w_i to $\mathrm{successor}(w_{i-1})$, and go to stage $i + 1$.

Note that in all three cases, A_i has at least one more element than A_{i-1}, so A will be infinite. And at stage i, we ensured that ϕ_i will not be a compressor for A. So A is not $\mathrm{F_{PR}}$-compressible, since no partial recursive function is a compressor for it. □

7 Conclusions and Open Problems

This paper defined and studied the recursion-theoretic analogues of the complexity-theoretic notions of ranking and compression. We particularly sought to determine where rankable and compressible sets could be found. For example, we found that all coRE-complete sets are recursively compressible but no RE-complete set is recursively compressible, and that no RE-complete or coRE-complete set is recursively (or even partial-recursively) rankable. Nonetheless, we showed that every 1-truth-table degree—even the one containing the RE-complete and the coRE-complete sets—contains recursively rankable sets. And we also showed that every nonempty coRE cylinder is recursively compressible.

We mention some open issues that we commend to the interested reader. We showed that all nonempty co-r.e. cylinders (and thus all coRE-complete sets and all nonempty co-

r.e. index sets) are recursively compressible. Can one prove, or disprove, that all infinite co-r.e. sets are recursively compressible, or at least partial-recursively compressible? We conjecture that there exist infinite, co-r.e. sets that are not even partial-recursively compressible, although this paper establishes that only for the larger class Δ_2^0. Also, can one construct a set that is F_{PR}-rankable but not $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable, and if so, what is the smallest class in which such a set can be constructed? Note that by Theorems 7 and 10, separating F_{PR}-rankable from $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{REC}}$-rankable on any set in $\mathrm{RE} \cup \mathrm{coRE}$ is impossible.

References

[ÁJ93] C. Álvarez and B. Jenner. A very hard log-space counting class. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 107:3–30, 1993.

[All85] E. Allender. Invertible functions, 1985. PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology.

[Ber76] L. Berman. On the structure of complete sets. In *Proceedings of the 17th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 76–80. IEEE Computer Society, October 1976.

[BFH78] G. Brassard, S. Fortune, and J. Hopcroft. A note on cryptography and $\mathrm{NP} \cap \mathrm{coNP} - \mathrm{P}$. Technical Report TR-338, Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, April 1978.

[BS85] J. Balcázar and U. Schöning. Bi-immune sets for complexity classes. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 18(1):1–10, 1985.

[FFNR03] S. Fenner, L. Fortnow, A. Naik, and J. Rogers. Inverting onto functions. *Information and Computation*, 186(1):90–103, 2003.

[GH96] J. Goldsmith and S. Homer. Scalability and the isomorphism problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 57(3):137–143, 1996.

[GHK92] J. Goldsmith, L. Hemachandra, and K. Kunen. Polynomial-time compression. *Computational Complexity*, 2(1):18–39, 1992.

[GS85] A. Goldberg and M. Sipser. Compression and ranking. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 440–448. ACM Press, May 1985.

[GS91] A. Goldberg and M. Sipser. Compression and ranking. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 20(3):524–536, 1991.

[HM83] S. Homer and W. Maass. Oracle dependent properties of the lattice of NP sets. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 24(3):279–289, 1983.

[Hom86] S. Homer. On simple and creative sets in NP. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 47(2):169–180, 1986.

[HOZZ06] L. Hemaspaandra, M. Ogihara, M. Zaki, and M. Zimand. The complexity of finding top-Toda-equivalence-class members. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 39(5):669–684, 2006.

[HR90] L. Hemachandra and S. Rudich. On the complexity of ranking. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 41(2):251–271, 1990.

[HRW97] L. Hemaspaandra, J. Rothe, and G. Wechsung. Easy sets and hard certificate schemes. *Acta Informatica*, 34(11):859–879, 1997.

[Huy90] D. Huynh. The complexity of ranking simple languages. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 23(1):1–20, 1990.

[Kle43] S. Kleene. Recursive predicates and quantifiers. *Transactions of the AMS*, 53:41–73, 1943.

[LLS75] R. Ladner, N. Lynch, and A. Selman. A comparison of polynomial time reducibilities. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 1(2):103–124, 1975.

[Mos47] A. Mostowski. On definable sets of positive integers. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 34:81–112, 1947.

[MS72] A. Meyer and L. Stockmeyer. The equivalence problem for regular expressions with squaring requires exponential space. In *Proceedings of the 13th IEEE Symposium on Switching and Automata Theory*, pages 125–129. IEEE Press, October 1972.

[Myh55] J. Myhill. Creative sets. *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 1:97–108, 1955.

[Odi89] P. Odifreddi. *Classical Recursion Theory.* Elsevier Science Publishers, 1989.

[Pos44] E. Post. Recursively enumerable sets of integers and their decision problems. *Bulletin of the AMS*, 50:284–316, 1944.

[Rog67] H. Rogers, Jr. *The Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability.* McGraw-Hill, 1967.

[Rot99] J. Rothe. Complexity of certificates, heuristics, and counting types, with applications to cryptography and circuit theory. Habilitation thesis, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, Institut für Informatik, Jena, Germany, June 1999.

[Sel82] A. Selman. Analogues of semirecursive sets and effective reducibilities to the study of NP complexity. *Information and Control*, 52(1):36–51, 1982.

[Soa87] R. Soare. *Recursively Enumerable Sets and Degrees: A Study of Computable Functions and Computably Generated Sets*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, 1987.

[Sto76] L. Stockmeyer. The polynomial-time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 3(1):1–22, 1976.

[Tor86] L. Torenvliet. Structural concepts in relativized hierarchies, 1986. PhD thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.